



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/727,182

11/30/2000

Niels Mache

282447US8X

5601

22850

7590

08/25/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2455

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/25/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

**Continuation Sheet for Advisory Action 20090818**

**11. Continued:**

**Applicant argues on page 8 of the remarks** - *"...Vaudreuil determine the next destination for each message based only on information from the system database 147, not any meta information from the message."*

**Examiner's response** - Vaudreuil explicitly discloses the use of meta information in Col. 26 line 30 - Col. 27 line 26. Particularly, message routing can be based on meta information describing the content as well as user preferences in relation to the meta information. As such, routing in Vaudreuil is not necessarily only based on the system database. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

**Applicant argues on page 8 of the remarks** - *"Further, column 19, lines 49-54 of Vaudreuil describe that the recipient selects the preferred media for receiving messages, not the sender. Accordingly, not only does Vaudreuil fail to teach or suggest "the message broker automatically selects an appropriate second transfer medium depending on content of the client database and the meta information of the message without processing the content of the message," to modify the device of Vaudreuil to include this feature would make the device described by Vaudreuil unsuitable for its intended purpose, which is to allow the recipient to select the preferred media for receiving messages."*

**Examiner's response** - Its not clear how the claimed meta-information is necessarily tied to the sender making the selection of media delivery. In other words, user preferences does not necessarily negate the use of meta-information. Regardless, Page 9 of applicant's specification indicates meta information generally provides information about the message content. Vaudreuil teaches this type of information in Col. 26 line 30 - Col. 27 line 26 and how it can be used to route the message to a particularly destination. As such, Vaudreuil teaches the claimed meta-information and Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

**Applicant argues on page 9 of the remarks** - *"... Vaudreuil not only fails to describe unique receiver keys valid only for an intended receiver and a given message, but in fact teaches to the contrary. It is respectfully submitted that Vaudreuil does not in any way describe a device that encrypts messages with unique receiver keys valid only for an intended receiver and a given message."*

**Examiner's response** - Vaudreuil explicitly teaches the use of Internet Privacy Enhanced Mail (PEM) technology (Col. 28 lines 63-67). PEM technology makes use of a public key and a private key. As such, a given message encrypted through a user's public key can only be decrypted by the same user with the corresponding private key. As such, a given message encrypted under PEM technology will only be valid for the intended receiver as the receiver. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2455

**13. Continued:**

Claims 1-21 are rejected based on the same grounds of rejection as presented in the office action mailed March 17, 2009. Claim 15 is rejected based on the additional logic of the previous rejection of claim 22 that is now canceled.